

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MOHAMMAD A. AZAD,
Plaintiff,

-v-

LOUIS A. MOLINA, *et al.*,
Defendants.

24-CV-1623 (JPO)

ORDER

J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge:

On April 1, 2025, the Court denied Plaintiff Mohammad A. Azad’s motion for leave to amend his complaint a second time and directed Azad to oppose Defendants’ motions to dismiss by April 14, 2025. (ECF No. 71 at 2.) Instead of opposing these motions, Azad filed another letter again asking the Court for leave to amend his complaint, this time because he allegedly “learned of new facts and information related to the wrongful termination of [his] employment.” (ECF No. 73 at 1.)

As the Court held in its previous Order, “Azad’s request to amend his complaint a second time was unduly delayed and that there would be prejudice to Defendants if the Court granted his motion.” (ECF No. 71 at 2.) Azad failed to show that his renewed request would remedy this unfairness to Defendants. Further, he has not identified what the new facts are so that the Court could analyze whether they would be permissible amendments or futile. *See Ruotolo v. City of New York*, 514 F.3d 184, 191 (2d Cir. 2008). Because a second amendment would cause undue delay and prejudice Defendants, Azad’s motion is again denied.

If Azad has identified new facts that are relevant to his complaint, he may include these in his opposition to Defendants’ motions to dismiss, and Defendants may respond in their replies.

Azad shall oppose Defendants' motions to dismiss his amended complaint by May 6, 2025, or those motions will be considered unopposed. This is the final time the Court will extend Azad's time to oppose these motions, absent compelling circumstances.

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 23, 2025
New York, New York



J. PAUL OETKEN
United States District Judge